REMARKS

The Office Action has been received and reviewed. In light of the above amendments and following remarks, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Claims 1, 4-7, 9-15, 20, 22-23, 25, and 28-29 are currently pending in the application. Claims 3, 16-19, 21, 26-27, and 30-33 are canceled.

Claims 1-6, 20-22, and 28-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Madour II (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0053431).

The present claims recite "a timer, wherein the processor removes a connection from the connection table in response to an expiration of the timer." (Claim 1, Claims 20 and 28 contain similar limitations) Hence, the present claims require the use of "a timer" in the handset. The Examiner cites Madour II to meet this limitation. (Office Action page 3, regarding claim 3 – note Applicants' believe the Examiner meant Madour II rather than Bertrand) However, at the cited locations ([0032], [0034], and [0037]), Madour II fails to disclose a timer or removal of PZIDs from the list. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Madour II fails to anticipate the present invention and the rejected claims should now be allowed.

Claims 7, 9-15, 23, 29, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertrand et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,876,640) in view of Madour I (U.S. Patent No. 6,834,050). Claims 16-19, 25-27, 30 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertrand in view of Madour II.

The present claims recite "buffering received data from a network that is designated to a wireless communication device, storing the received data until the wireless communication device is located on one of the connections in the connection set." (Claims 7, 23 and 29) Hence, the present claims require the use of a buffer to store data until it can be transmitted to the handset. The Examiner cites Bertrand to meet this limitation. (Office Action page 6) However, at the cited locations (col. 1, lines 65-67; col. 2, line 49 to col. 3, line 43), Bertrand fails to disclose storing packet data in a buffer while a connection is made and the data can be transferred to a handset. Likewise, Madour I and Madour II fail to meet this buffer limitation.

Accordingly, for at least this reason, Bertrand, Madour I and Madour II fails to obviate the present invention and the rejected claims should now be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 25, 2008   By: /Darren M. Simon, Reg. No. 47,946/

           Darren M. Simon, Reg. No. 47,946
           (858) 845-2472

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502